



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/107,524	06/30/98	CHAMBERS	TS

CORPORATE PATENT COUNSEL  
U S PHILIPS CORPORATION  
580 WHITE PLAINS ROAD  
TARRYTOWN NY 10591

WM02/1206

F PHA-23.406

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2674

DATE MAILED:

12/06/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
**09/107,524**

Applicant(s)

**PAUL CHAMBERS**

Examiner

**FRANCIS NGUYEN**

Group Art Unit

**2674**



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Sep 18, 2000

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1035 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire THREE month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 2-5, 7, 9-11, and 13-22 is/are pending in the applicat

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 2-5, 7, 9-11, and 13-22 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2674

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. The amendment filed on 9/18/00 is entered.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 2-5, 7, 9-11, 13-22 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admission in view of Thompson et al. ( U.S. Patent 5,600, 347 ).

4. As to **claim 19**, Applicant's admission teaches a method of converting an image stored on a digital versatile disc to an image displayed on a computer monitor, comprising the steps of retrieving from a DVD an image having a resolution of MxN pixels, displaying the expanded XxY image on a computer monitor( Disclosure, page 2, lines 1-29). However, Applicant's admission fails to disclose a step of expanding horizontal resolution wherein the product XxY is greater than the product MxN. Thompson et al. teaches a step of horizontal expansion of low resolution display mode to high resolution display ( Abstract, column 4, lines 60-65, also horizontal expansion logic 208 in figure 2, figure 7). **It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the**

Art Unit: 2674

invention to utilize the method indicated by applicant's admission and modify the step of expanding horizontal resolution, as taught by Thompson et al. to obtain the combined method Applicant's admission-Thompson et al. because it would result in high quality of motion display with high resolution, without extensive memory requirement.

5. As to **claims 2-5**, note the same citations in paragraph 4. Note that Thompson et al. teaches **oversampling, interpolation** method ( figure 4, column 6, lines 60-65).

6. As to **claims 7 and 20**, note **step of decimation** ( figure 3) for discarding undesired pixels to reach the expanded image resolution of XxY pixels. Note the teaching of **flat display resolution SVGA screen** ( column 6, lines 37-45); this corresponds to the resolution 800x600 or higher.

7. As to **claims 9-11, 21**, note the arrangement for displaying an image stored on a digital versatile disk described in Applicant's background description( pages 1 -2). Note that Thompson et al. teaches **image processor 202** ( figure 2), **computer monitor 112**( figure 2).

8. As to **claims 13-18, and 22**, note the same citation in paragraph 4. Also note that Thompson teaches image signal input( input to 202 of figure 2, waveform A in figure 9), image expansion circuitry( **horizontal expansion logic 208**, figure 2), display signal output( digital output to flat display 112, figure 2), interpolator ( column 4, line 66) .

#### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments filed on 9/18/00 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2674

**Applicant's argument as to cited art lacking teaching of expanding horizontal resolution is not valid since the combination Applicant's-Thompson et al. meets all claimed limitations, as described in the rejection above.**

**Due to lack of claim breadth, the pending claims are all rejected.**

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Francis Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-8858. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe, can be reached on (703) 305-4709. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-9051.

Art Unit: 2674

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Francis Nguyen

November 30th, 2000

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Hjerpe', is positioned above the printed name and title.

**RICHARD HJERPE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**